

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application.
Please amend Claims 1-4, 8-21, 45-48, 50-54, 56-57, 60, and 62-70 as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A method for determining if ~~a server~~ an agent should be assigned to ~~a server~~ an agent pool for a work type in a work processing facility, the ~~server~~ agent pool configured to retain an indication of ~~servers~~ agents that process work of the work type, comprising:

5 determining if ~~a server's~~ an agent's first value for the work type is less than ~~a server's~~ an agent's second value for the work type, wherein the first value indicates the ~~server's~~ agent's positive indicator for the work type and the second value indicates the ~~server's~~ agent's negative indicator for the work type;

10 determining a composite preference value for the work type if the ~~server's~~ agent's first value for the work type is less than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type;

 determining if the determined composite preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type; and

15 sending an indication to the work processing facility that the ~~server~~ agent is suitable for assignment to the ~~server~~ agent pool for the work type if the composite preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's~~ agent's second value for the work type.

2. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1 wherein determining the composite preference value comprises:

5 determining a dynamic preference value for the work type, wherein the determined dynamic preference value reflects a measurement of the work processing facility's need to have servers perform work of the work type;

 accessing a user-selectable composite preference value function that is configured to determine a composite preference value; and

10 providing the ~~server's agent's~~ determined preference value for the work type and the determined dynamic preference value for the work type to the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function to generate the composite preference value for the work type.

3. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 2 wherein the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

adding the ~~server's agent's~~ determined preference value for the work type to the determined dynamic preference value for the work type.

4. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 2 wherein the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

multiplying the ~~server's agent's~~ determined preference value for the work type by a first scaling factor to produce a scaled ~~server agent~~ first value;

5 multiplying the dynamic preference value for the work type by a second scaling factor to produce a scaled dynamic preference value; and

adding the scaled ~~server agent~~ first value to the scaled dynamic preference value to produce the composite preference value.

5. (Original) The method of claim 4 wherein one of the first scaling factor and the second scaling factor is unity.

6. (Original) The method of claim 4 wherein the first scaling factor equals the second scaling factor.

7. (Original) The method of claim 2 wherein the determined dynamic preference value for the work type is determined from at least one of a service level value for the work

5 type, a queue condition for the work type, an alarm condition for the work type, an answer delay for the work type, a desired service level for the work type, a call abandonment rate for the work type, and an operator intervention value for the work type.

8. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 2 wherein the ~~server~~agent is at least one of a human agent or a robotic agent and wherein the accessed composite preference value function is further configured to generate the composite preference value using data associated with at least one of a human agent or a robotic agent.

9. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, further including not assigning the ~~server~~agent to the ~~server~~agent pool of the work type if the ~~server's~~agent's first value is less than the ~~server's~~agent's second value unless the composite preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's~~agent's second value for the work type.

5 10. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1 wherein the ~~server's~~agent's first value for the work type and the ~~server's~~agent's second value for the work type are retained in a table and wherein determining if the ~~server's~~agent's first value for the work type is less than the ~~server's~~agent's second value for the work type further comprises examining the table to retrieve the ~~server's~~agent's first value and the ~~server's~~agent's second value.

11. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, further including not determining the composite preference value if the ~~server's~~agent's first value for the work type is greater than or equal to the ~~server's~~agent's second value.

12. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, further including the work processing facility receiving the indication and assigning the ~~server~~agent to the ~~server~~agent pool of the work type as a back-up server.

13. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, further comprising:
re-determining the composite preference value for the work type;
determining if the re-determined composite preference value for the work type is
greater than the ~~server's~~agent's second value; and
- 5 sending another indication to the work processing facility that the ~~server~~agent
should be removed from the ~~server-agent~~ pool for the work type if the re-determined
composite preference value for the work type is less than the ~~server's~~agent's second value.
14. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1 wherein determining if the
~~server's~~agent's first value exceeds the ~~server's~~agent's second value is determined a plurality
of times, the method further comprising:
examining an evaluation parameter to determine if the determination of whether the
- 5 ~~server's~~agent's first value exceeds the ~~server's~~agent's second value should be determined
for another time of the plurality of times.
15. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1 wherein the work processing
facility has a plurality of ~~server-agent~~ pools for a plurality of work types and wherein a
composite preference value is determined for each work type of the plurality of work types
if the ~~server's~~agent's first value for that work type is less than the ~~server's~~agent's second
value for that work type.
16. (Currently Amended) A method for determining if ~~a server an agent~~ should
be assigned to at least one ~~server-agent~~ pool of a plurality of ~~server-agent~~ pools in a work
processing facility that processes work for a plurality of work types, each ~~server-agent~~ pool
configured to retain an indication of ~~servers~~agents that process work of a respective work
- 5 type of the plurality of work types, comprising:
for at least one work type of the plurality of work types:

determining if the ~~server's agent's~~ first value for the work type is less than the ~~server's agent's~~ second value for the work type, wherein the first value indicates the ~~server's agent's~~ positive indicator for the work type and the second value indicates the ~~server's agent's~~ negative indicator for the work type;

determining a composite preference value for the work type if the ~~server's agent's~~ first value for the work type is less than the ~~server's agent's~~ second value for the work type;

determining if the determined composite preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's agent's~~ second value for the work type; and

sending an indication to the work processing facility that the ~~server agent~~ is suitable for assignment to the ~~server agent~~ pool for the work type if the composite preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's agent's~~ second value for the work type.

17. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 16, further comprising:

determining for which ~~server agent~~ pools the ~~server agent~~ has been assigned, wherein determining if the ~~server's agent's~~ first value for the work type is less than the ~~server's agent's~~ second value for the work type is performed only if the ~~server agent~~ is not assigned to the ~~server agent~~ pool for the work type.

18. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 16 wherein determining if the ~~server's agent's~~ first value for the work type is less than the ~~server's agent's~~ second value for the work type is performed for all work types of the plurality of work types for which the ~~server agent~~ has not been assigned to the respective ~~server agent~~ pool for the work type.

19. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 16 wherein determining the composite preference value comprises:

determining a dynamic preference value for the work type, wherein the determined dynamic preference value reflects a measurement of the work processing facility's need to have ~~servers~~ agents perform work of the work type;

accessing a user-selectable composite preference value function that is configured to determine a composite preference value; and

providing the ~~server's~~ agent's determined first value for the work type and the determined dynamic preference value for the work type to the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function to generate the composite preference value for the work type.

20. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 19 wherein the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

adding the ~~server's~~ agent's determined first value for the work type to the determined dynamic preference value for the work type.

21. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 19 wherein the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

multiplying the ~~server's~~ agent's determined first value for the work type by a first scaling factor to produce a scaled ~~server~~ agent first value;

multiplying the dynamic preference value for the work type by a second scaling factor to produce a scaled dynamic preference value; and

adding the scaled ~~server~~ agent first value to the scaled dynamic preference value to produce the composite preference value.

22. (Original) A method for determining in a call center if an agent should be assigned to an agent pool for a work type processed by the call center, the agent pool configured to retain an indication of agents that process work of the work type, comprising:

5 determining if an agent's first value for the work type is less than an agent's second
value for the work type, wherein the first value indicates the agent's positive indicator for the
work type and the second value indicates the agent's negative indicator for the work type;
determining a composite preference value for the work type if the agent's first value
for the work type is less than the agent's second value for the work type;
determining if the determined composite preference value for the work type is greater
10 than the agent's second value for the work type; and
sending an indication to a work distributor in the call center that the agent is suitable
for assignment to the agent pool for the work type if the composite preference value for the
work type is greater than the agent's second value for the work type.

23. (Original) The method of claim 22 wherein determining the composite
preference value comprises:

5 determining a dynamic preference value for the work type, wherein the determined
dynamic preference value reflects a measurement of the call center's need to have agents
perform work of the work type;

accessing a user-selectable composite preference value function that is configured to
determine a composite preference value; and

10 providing the agent's determined first value for the work type and the determined
dynamic preference value for the work type to the accessed user-selectable composite
preference value function to generate the composite preference value for the work type.

24. (Original) The method of claim 23 wherein the accessed user-selectable
composite preference value function comprises:

adding the agent's determined first value for the work type to the determined dynamic
preference value for the work type.

25. (Original) The method of claim 23 wherein the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

 multiplying the agent's determined first value for the work type by a first scaling factor to produce a scaled agent first value;

5 multiplying the dynamic preference value for the work type by a second scaling factor to produce a scaled dynamic preference value; and

 adding the scaled agent first value to the scaled dynamic preference value to produce the composite preference value.

26. (Original) The method of claim 25 wherein one of the first scaling factor and the second scaling factor is unity.

27. (Original) The method of claim 25 wherein the first scaling factor equals the second scaling factor.

28. (Original) The method of claim 23 wherein the determined dynamic preference value for the work type is determined from at least one of a service level value for the work type, a queue condition for the work type, an alarm condition for the work type, an answer delay for the work type, a desired service level for the work type, a call abandonment
5 rate for the work type, and an operator intervention value for the work type.

29. (Original) The method of claim 23 wherein the agent is at least one of a human agent or a robotic agent and wherein the accessed composite preference value function is further configured to generate the composite preference value using data associated with at least one of a human agent or a robotic agent.

30. (Original) The method of claim 22 wherein the agent's first value for the work type and the agent's second value for the work type are retained in a table and wherein determining if the agent's first value for the work type is less than the agent's second value for the work type further comprises examining the table to retrieve the agent's first value and
5 the agent's second value.

31. (Original) The method of claim 22, further including the work distributor receiving the indication and assigning the agent to the agent pool of the work type as a back-up agent.

32. (Original) The method of claim 22, further comprising:
re-determining the composite preference value for the work type;
determining if the re-determined composite preference value for the work type is greater than the agent's second value; and
5 sending another indication to the work distributor that the agent should be removed from the agent pool for the work type if the re-determined composite preference value for the work type is less than the agent's second value.

33. (Original) The method of claim 22 wherein the call center has a plurality of agent pools for a plurality of work types, and wherein:
a composite preference value is determined for each work type of the plurality of work types if the agent's first value for that work type is less than the agent's second value
5 for that work type.

34. (Original) A method for determining in a work distributor if a server should be assigned to a server pool for a work type to which the work distributor assigns servers, the

server pool configured to retain an indication of servers that process work of the work type, comprising:

- 5 determining if a server's first value for the work type is less than the server's second value for the work type, wherein the first value indicates the server's positive indicator for the work type and the second value indicates the server's negative indicator for the work type;
- determining a composite preference value for the work type if the server's first value for the work type is less than the server's second value for the work type;
- 10 determining if the determined composite preference value for the work type is greater than the server's second value for the work type; and
- assigning the server to the server pool for the work type if the composite preference value for the work type is greater than the server's second value for the work type.

35. (Original) The method of claim 34 wherein determining the composite preference value comprises:

- determining a dynamic preference value for the work type, wherein the determined dynamic preference value reflects a measurement of a work processing facility's need to have
- 5 servers perform work of the work type;
- accessing a user-selectable composite preference value function that is configured to determine a composite preference value; and
- providing the server's determined preference value for the work type and the determined dynamic preference value for the work type to the accessed user-selectable
- 10 composite preference value function to generate the composite preference value for the work type.

36. (Original) The method of claim 35 wherein the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

adding the server's determined preference value for the work type to the determined dynamic preference value for the work type.

37. (Original) The method of claim 35 wherein the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

multiplying the server's determined preference value for the work type by a first scaling factor to produce a scaled server first value;

5 multiplying the dynamic preference value for the work type by a second scaling factor to produce a scaled dynamic preference value; and

adding the scaled server first value to the scaled dynamic preference value to produce the composite preference value.

38. (Original) The method of claim 37 wherein one of the first scaling factor and the second scaling factor is unity.

39. (Original) The method of claim 37 wherein the first scaling factor equals the second scaling factor.

40. (Original) The method of claim 35 wherein the determined dynamic reference value for the work type is determined from at least one of a service level value for the work type, a queue condition for the work type, an alarm condition for the work type, an answer delay for the work type, a desired service level for the work type, a call abandonment rate for the work type, and an operator intervention value for the work type.

5

41. (Original) The method of claim 35 wherein the server is at least one of human agent or a robotic agent and wherein the accessed composite preference value function is

further configured to generate the composite preference value using data associated with at least one of a human agent or a robotic agent.

42. (Original) The method of claim 34 wherein the server is not assigned the server pool of the work type if the server's first value is less than the server's second value unless the composite preference value for the work type is greater than the server's second value for the work type.

43. (Original) The method of claim 34 wherein the server's first value for the work type and the server's second value for the work type are retained in a table and wherein determining if the server's first value for the work type is less than the server's second value for the work type further comprises examining the table to retrieve the server's first value and the server's second value.

44. (Original) The method of claim 34 wherein the assigned server is designated as a back-up server in the server pool and wherein back-up servers in the server pool are configured for removal from the server pool by the work

45. (Currently Amended) A computer-readable medium whose contents cause a computer system to determine if ~~a server~~an agent should be assigned to ~~a server~~an agent pool for a work type in a work processing facility, the ~~server~~agent pool configured to retain an indication of ~~servers~~agents that process work of the work type, by performing the steps of:

determining if ~~a server's~~an agent's first value for the work type is less than ~~a server's~~an agent's second value for the work type, wherein the first value indicates the ~~server's~~agent's positive indicator for the work type and the second value indicates the ~~server's~~agent's negative indicator for the work type;

10 determining a composite preference value for the work type if the ~~server's agent's~~ first
value for the work type is less than the ~~server's agent's~~ second value for the work type;
 determining if the determined composite preference value for the work type is greater
than the ~~server's agent's~~ second value for the work type; and
 sending an indication to the work processing facility that the ~~server agent~~ is suitable
15 for assignment to the ~~server agent~~ pool for the work type if the composite preference value
for the work type is greater than the ~~server's agent's~~ second value for the work type.

46. (Currently Amended) The computer-readable medium of claim 45 wherein
determining the composite preference value comprises:

 determining a dynamic preference value for the work type, wherein the determined
dynamic preference value reflects a measurement of the work processing facility's need to
5 have ~~servers agents~~ perform work of the work type;
 accessing a user-selectable composite preference value function that is configured to
determine a composite preference value; and
 providing the ~~server's agent's~~ determined preference value for the work type and the
determined dynamic preference value for the work type to the accessed user-selectable
10 composite preference value function to generate the composite preference value for the work
type.

47. (Currently Amended) The computer-readable medium of claim 46 wherein
the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

 adding the ~~server's agent's~~ determined preference value for the work type to the
determined dynamic preference value for the work type.

48. (Currently Amended) The computer-readable medium of claim 46 wherein
the accessed user-selectable composite preference value function comprises:

- multiplying the ~~server's agent's~~ determined first value for the work type by a first scaling factor to produce a scaled ~~server agent~~ first value;
- 5 multiplying the dynamic preference value for the work type by a second scaling factor to produce a scaled dynamic preference value; and
- adding the scaled ~~server agent~~ first value to the scaled dynamic preference value to produce the composite preference value.

49. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 46 wherein the determined dynamic preference value for the work type is determined from at least one of a service level value for the work type, a queue condition for the work type, an alarm condition for the work type, an answer delay for the work type, a desired service level for the work type, a call abandonment rate for the work type, and an operator intervention value for the work type.
- 5

50. (Currently Amended) The computer-readable medium of claim 45, further comprising:
- re-determining the composite preference value for the work type;
- determining if the re-determined composite preference value for the work type is
- 5 greater than the ~~server's agent's~~ second value; and
- sending another indication to the work processing facility that the ~~server agent~~ should be removed from the ~~server agent~~ pool for the work type if the re-determined composite preference value for the work type is less than the ~~server's agent's~~ second value.

51. (Currently Amended) The computer-readable medium of claim 45 wherein determining if the ~~server's agent's~~ first value exceeds the ~~server's agent's~~ second value is determined a plurality of times, the computer-readable medium further comprising:

examining an evaluation parameter to determine if the determination of whether the
5 ~~server's agent's~~ first value exceeds the ~~server's agent's~~ second value should be determined
for another time of the plurality of times.

52. (Currently Amended) A system for determining if ~~a server an agent~~ should
be assigned to ~~a server an agent~~ pool for a work type in a work processing facility, the ~~server~~
~~agent~~ pool configured to retain an indication of ~~servers agents~~ that process work of the work
type, comprising:

5 a first comparator configured to determine if ~~a server's an agent's~~ first value for the
work type is less than the ~~server's agent's~~ second value for the work type, wherein the first
value indicates the ~~server's agent's~~ positive indicator for the work type and the second value
indicates the ~~server's agent's~~ negative indicator for the work type;

a second comparator configured to determine a composite preference value for the
10 work type if the ~~server's agent's~~ first value for the work type is less than the ~~server's agent's~~
second value for the work type;

a third comparator configured to determine if the determined composite preference
value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's agent's~~ second value for the work type;
and

15 a result indicator configured to send an indication to the work processing facility that
the ~~server agent~~ is suitable for assignment to the ~~server agent~~ pool for the work type if the
composite preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's agent's~~ second value
for the work type.

53. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 52 wherein the third comparator
comprises:

a determiner configured to determine a dynamic preference value for the work type, wherein the dynamic preference value reflects a measurement of the work processing facility's need to have ~~servers~~ agents perform work of the work type.

54. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 53 wherein the third comparator further includes:

5 a processor configured to provide the ~~server's~~ agent's determined first value for the work type and the determined dynamic preference value for the work type to a user-selectable composite preference value function configured to generate the composite preference value for the work type.

55. (Original) The system of claim 54 wherein the third comparator further includes:

a function provider that provides the user-selectable composite preference value function that is configured to generate the composite preference value.

56. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 54 wherein the processor is configured to perform the operations of a user-selectable composite preference value function that adds the ~~server's~~ agent's determined first value to the determined dynamic preference value for the work type.

57. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 54 wherein the processor is configured to perform the operations of a user-selectable composite preference value function that multiplies the ~~server's~~ agent's determined first value by a first scaling factor to produce a scaled ~~server~~ agent first value, multiplies the dynamic preference value for the work type by a second scaling factor to produce a scaled dynamic preference value, and adds the scaled ~~server~~ agent first value to the scaled dynamic preference value.

58. (Original) The system of claim 57 wherein one of the first scaling factor and the second scaling factor is unity.

59. (Original) The system of claim 57 wherein the first scaling factor equals the second scaling factor.

60. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 54 wherein the ~~server agent~~ is at least one of a human agent or a robotic agent and wherein the processor in executing the user-selectable composite value function is further configured to determine a composite preference value using data associated with at least one of a human agent or a robotic agent.

61. (Original) The system of claim 53 wherein the determiner is configured to determine a dynamic preference value for the work type from at least one of a service level value for the work type, a queue condition for the work type, an alarm condition for the work type, an answer delay for the work type, a desired service level for the work type, a call
5 abandonment rate for the work type, and an operator intervention value for the work type.

62. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 52 wherein the result indicator is configured to indicate that the ~~server agent~~ should not be assigned to the ~~server agent~~ pool of the work type if the ~~server's agent's~~ preference value is less than the ~~server's agent's~~ threshold value unless the composite preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's agent's~~ threshold value for the work type.

63. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 52, further including a table retaining the ~~server's agent's~~ preference value for the work type and the ~~server's agent's~~ threshold value for the work type, and wherein the first comparator is further configured to

examine the table to retrieve the ~~server's~~agent's preference value and the ~~server's~~agent's threshold value.

64. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 52 wherein the second comparator is configured not to determine the composite preference value if the ~~server's~~agent's preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's~~agent's threshold value.

65. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 52 wherein the second comparator is configured to re-determine the composite preference value for the work type, the system further comprising:

5 a fourth comparator that is configured to determine if the re-determined composite preference value for the work type is greater than the ~~server's~~agent's threshold value; and

a second result indicator that is configured to send another indication to the work processing facility that the ~~server~~agent should be removed from the ~~server~~agent pool for the work type if the re-determined composite preference value for the work type is less than the ~~server's~~agent's threshold value.

66. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 52 wherein the first comparator is configured to determine whether the ~~server's~~agent's preference value exceeds the ~~server's~~agent's threshold value a plurality of times, the system further comprising:

5 a timer that examines an evaluation parameter to determine if the determination of whether the ~~server's~~agent's preference value exceeds the ~~server's~~agent's threshold value should be re-determined for another time of the plurality of times.

67. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 52 wherein the work processing facility has a plurality of ~~server~~agent pools for a plurality of work types and wherein the second comparator is further configured to determine a composite preference value for each

work type of the plurality of work types if the ~~server's agent's~~ preference, value for that work
5 type is less than the ~~server's agent's~~ threshold value for that work type.

68. (Currently Amended) A computer memory containing ~~server agent~~ data usable
for assigning a ~~server an agent~~ to a ~~server an agent~~ pool for a work type in a work
processing facility, the data structure comprising an ordered series of entries each
corresponding to the ~~server's agent's~~ positive indicator for the work type and the ~~server's~~
5 ~~agent's~~ negative indicator for the work type, a value of each entry in the ordered series
indicating the relative extent to which the ~~server agent~~ prefers to receive work for the work
type and to which the ~~server agent~~ prefers not to receive work for the work type, such that
the value of the entries may be used to assign the ~~server agent~~ to the ~~server agent~~ pool for
the work type.

69. (Currently Amended) The data structure of claim 68, further comprising an
entry corresponding to a composite preference value for the work type indicating the relative
extent to which the work processing facility's preference for the ~~server agent~~ receiving work
of the work type exceeds the ~~server's agent's~~ negative indicator for not receiving work for
the work type.

70. (Currently Amended) The data structure of claim 69 wherein a value for the
entry corresponding to composite preference value for the work type equals a value for the
~~server's agent's~~ position for the work type and a value for a dynamic preference for the work
type that reflects the work processing facility's preference for having the ~~server agent~~
perform the work type.

71. (Previously Presented) A method for determining if a server should be
assigned to process work items having a work type, comprising:

determining if a server's work value for the work type is one of less than a threshold value or equal to the threshold value, wherein the work value represents an inclination to performing work of the work type; and

determining a composite work value for the work type if the server's work value for the work type is one of less than the threshold value or equal to the threshold value.

72. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 71 wherein determining the composite work value for the work type comprises locating a previously calculated composite work value for the work type in a memory.

73. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 71 wherein the server is one server of a plurality of servers and wherein at least another server of the plurality of servers uses the threshold value for the work type.

74. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 71 wherein the server is one server of a plurality of servers and wherein at least another server of the plurality of servers uses the threshold value.

75. (Previously Presented) A method for determining if a server should be assigned to process work items having a work type in a work processing facility, comprising:
comparing the server's work value for the work type to a threshold value to determine if the server should be assigned to process work items having the work type, wherein the work value represents an inclination for performing work of the work type;

sending an indication to the work processing facility that the server is suitable for assignment to process work items of the work if comparing the server's work value for the work type with the threshold value indicates that the server should be assigned to process work items having the work type;

10 comparing a composite work value for the work type to the threshold value if
 comparing the server's work value for the work type with the threshold value indicates that
 the server should not be assigned to process work items having the work type; and
 sending an indication to the work processing facility that the server is suitable for
 assignment to process work items of the work type if comparing the composite work value
15 for the work type with the threshold value indicates that the server should be assigned to
 process work items having the work type.

76. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 75 wherein comparing the
server's work value for the work type to the threshold value comprises determining if the
server's work value for the work type is one of less than the threshold value or equal to the
threshold value.

77. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 75 wherein comparing the
composite work value for the work type to the threshold value comprises determining if the
composite work value for the work type at least equals the threshold value.

78. (Previously Presented) A method for determining if a server should be
assigned to process a work item having a work type in a work processing facility,
comprising:

5 determining if a server's work value for the work type is one of less than a threshold
 value or equal to the threshold value, wherein the work value represents an inclination to
 performing work of the work type;

 determining a composite work value for the work type if the server's work value for
the work type is less than the threshold value;

10 determining if the determined composite work value for the work type is greater than
 the threshold value; and

sending an indication to the work processing facility that the server is suitable for assignment to process work items of the work type if the composite work value for the work type is greater than the threshold value.

79. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 78 wherein the work processing facility contains a plurality of servers and wherein assigning work items to at least another server uses the threshold value.

80. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 78 wherein the work processing facility processes a plurality of work items having a plurality of work types and wherein the threshold value corresponds to the work type.

81. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 78 wherein the work processing facility contains a plurality of server pools, such that each work type has a corresponding server pool, and wherein sending the indication to the work processing facility results in the server's assignment to a server pool.

82. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 78 wherein determining if the server's work value for the work type is less than a threshold value occurs when the server completes another work item.

83. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 78 wherein the server is a server in a plurality of servers and wherein determining if the server's work value for the work type is less than a threshold value occurs when another server of the plurality of servers is unavailable to process the work item.

84. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 78 wherein the work item comprises a plurality of work attributes and wherein the work type represents a concatenation of the plurality of work attributes.

85. (Previously Presented) A method of attaining enterprise objectives in a work processing facility that uses a user-selectable composite preference value function in assigning servers to process work items related to the enterprise objectives, comprising:

5 determining that the selected user-selectable composite preference value function fails to optimize attainment of the enterprise objectives, wherein the selected user-selectable composite preference value function determines a composite preference value associated with the servers processing of work items;

examining a plurality of user-selectable composite preference value functions to identify another user-selectable composite preference value function; and

10 selecting the another user-selectable composite preference value function.

86. (Previously Presented) A method of attaining a plurality of enterprise objectives in a work processing facility having a plurality of servers, wherein each enterprise objective has a priority, comprising:

5 characterizing work items according to at least one associated enterprise objective; and

allocating the plurality of servers to process the work items on the basis of each work item's associated enterprise objective priority and each server's priority for processing a work item.

87. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 86 wherein each enterprise objective also has an associated goal and wherein an enterprise objective's priority rises with

respect to the non-attainment of the enterprise objective's goal relative to the non-attainment of at least another enterprise objective's goal.

88. (Previously Presented) A method for determining if a server of a plurality of servers associated with an enterprise should be assigned to process a work item of a plurality of work items having a plurality of work types to achieve the enterprise's objectives, comprising:

5 determining at least one composite preference value for a server of the plurality of servers for a work type of the plurality of work types using a composite preference value function that combines the server's preferences for the work type and the enterprise's preferences for the work type;

10 determining if the composite preference value function produces composite preference values that achieve the enterprise's objectives; and

locating another composite preference value function if the composite preference value function fails to achieve the enterprise's objectives.

89. (Previously Presented) A computer-readable medium whose contents cause a computer system to determine if a server should be assigned to process work items having a work type, comprising:

5 determining if a server's work value for the work type is one of less than a threshold value or equal to the threshold value, wherein the work value represents an inclination to performing work of the work type; and

determining a composite work value for the work type if the server's work value for the work type is one of less than the threshold value or equal to the threshold value.

90. (Previously Presented) A computer-readable medium whose contents cause a computer system to determine if a server should be assigned to process work items having a work type in a work processing facility, comprising:

5 comparing the server's work value for the work type to a threshold value to determine if the server should be assigned to process work items having the work type, wherein the work value represents an inclination for performing work of the work type;

10 sending an indication to the work processing facility that the server is suitable for assignment to process work items of the work if comparing the server's work value for the work type with the threshold value indicates that the server should be assigned to process work items having the work type;

comparing a composite work value for the work type to the threshold value if comparing the server's work value for the work type with the threshold value indicates that the server should not be assigned to process work items having the work type; and

15 sending an indication to the work processing facility that the server is suitable for assignment to process work items of the work type if comparing the composite work value for the work type with the threshold value indicates that the server should be assigned to process work items having the work type.

91. (Previously Presented) A computer-readable medium whose contents cause a computer system to attain a plurality of enterprise objectives in a work processing facility having a plurality of servers, wherein each enterprise objective has a priority, comprising:

5 characterizing work items according to at least one associated enterprise objective; and

allocating the plurality of servers to process the work items on the basis of each work item's associated enterprise objective priority and each server's priority for processing a work item.

92. (Previously Presented) A system that assigns a server to process work having a work type in a work processing facility, comprising:

5 a first comparator configured to compare a server's first value for the work type to a threshold value to determine if the server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type, wherein the first value indicates the server's inclination for performing work of the work type;

10 a second comparator configured to determine a composite preference value for the work type and compare the determined composite preference value for the work type to the threshold value to determine if the server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type; and

a result indicator configured to send an indication to the work processing facility that the server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type if at least one of the first comparator or the second comparator determines that the server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type.

93. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 92, further comprising:
a threshold value calculator configured to calculate the threshold value.

94. (Previously Presented) A system that assigns a plurality servers to process work items having a work type in a work processing facility, comprising:

5 at least one first comparator configured to compare a server's first value for a work item's work type to a threshold value to determine if the server is suitable for assignment to the work item, wherein the first value indicates the server's inclination for performing work of the work type;

at least one second comparator configured to determine a composite preference value for the work type and compare the determined composite preference value for the work type

10 to the threshold value to determine if the server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type; and

a result indicator configured to send an indication to the work processing facility that the server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type if at least one of the first comparator or the second comparator determines that the server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type.

95. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 94 wherein the at least one first comparator and the at least one second comparator are associated with a first computer, the system further comprising:

5 at least another first comparator associated with a second computer, wherein the at least another first comparator is configured to compare another server's first value for the work type to a threshold value to determine if the another server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type, wherein the first value indicates the another server's inclination for performing work of the work type; and

10 at least another second comparator associated with a second computer, wherein the at least another second comparator is configured to determine a composite preference value for the work type and compare the determined composite preference value for the work type to the threshold value to determine if the another server is suitable for assignment to work of the work type.

96. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 94, further comprising:

a resource limiter configured to receive a maximum server total for the work type and further configured to prevent the server's assignment to the work type if assignment of the server to the work type exceeds the received maximum server total.